arXiv:1411.6727v2 [math.CO] 23 Jan 2015

GRAPH SHARING GAME AND THE STRUCTURE OF WEIGHTED GRAPHS WITH A FORBIDDEN SUBDIVISION

ADAM GĄGOL, PIOTR MICEK, AND BARTOSZ WALCZAK

Abstract. The *graph sharing game* is played by two players, Alice and Bob, on a connected graph G with non-negative weights assigned to the vertices. Starting with Alice, the players take the vertices of G one by one, in each move keeping the set of all taken vertices connected, until the whole G has been taken. Each player wants to maximize the total weight of the vertices they have gathered.

It is proved that for any class $\mathcal{G}$ of graphs with an odd number of vertices and with forbidden subdivision of a fixed graph, there is a constant $c_{\mathcal{G}} > 0$ such that Alice can guarantee herself at least a $c_{\mathcal{G}}$-fraction of the total weight of G whenever $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Known examples show that this is no longer true if any of the two conditions on the class $\mathcal{G}$ (an odd number of vertices or a forbidden subdivision) is dropped. The main ingredient in the proof is a new structural result on weighted graphs with a forbidden subdivision.

1. Introduction

The *graph sharing game* is played by two players, Alice and Bob, on a connected graph G with non-negative weights assigned to the vertices. Starting with Alice, the players take the vertices of G one by one, in each move keeping the set of all taken vertices connected, until the whole G has been taken. Each player wants to maximize the total weight of the vertices they have gathered.

The above is one of the two graph sharing games introduced by Cibulka, Kynčl, Mészáros, Stolař and Valtr [4] and independently by Micek and Walczak [11, 12] as generalizations of Peter Winkler's "pizza game". They called it the graph sharing game with taken part connected or *game T*. The other game, called the graph sharing game with remaining part connected or *game R*, has the same rules except that the remaining (non-taken) part of the graph must be connected instead of the taken part. The "pizza game" is either of the two games played on a cycle. Cibulka et al. [3] and independently Knauer, Micek and Ueckerdt [8] proved that Alice has a strategy to collect at least 4/9 of the total weight of any cycle, which is best possible.

Easy examples show that there is no hope in obtaining a similar result for either game T or game R on general graphs [4, 11, 12]. However, an appropriate restriction on the parity of the number of vertices and the structure of the graph can yield the existence of good strategies of Alice.

For game T, Micek and Walczak [12] constructed very simple graphs (caterpillars and subdivided stars) with an even number of vertices and with arbitrarily small guaranteed outcome of Alice. On the other hand, they proved that Alice

Adam Gągol and Bartosz Walczak were supported by Polish National Science Center grant 2011/03/N/ST6/03111. The paper is based on results of Adam Gągol's master's thesis [6] and Bartosz Walczak's PhD thesis [18].

can always secure at least 1/4 of the total weight playing on a tree with an odd number of vertices. They also constructed a family of graphs with an odd number of vertices that are arbitrarily bad for Alice. These graphs contain subdivisions of arbitrarily large cliques. As the main result of this paper, we prove that these subdivisions are unavoidable.

Theorem 1.1. *For every positive integer n, there is $c_n \in (0,1]$ such that if G is a weighted connected graph with an odd number of vertices and with no subdivision of K_n, then Alice has a strategy to collect vertices of total weight at least $c_n w(G)$ in the graph sharing game on G with taken part connected, where $w(G)$ denotes the total weight of G.*

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 gives $c_n = \Omega(2^{-p(n)})$ for some polynomial p, and we make no effort to optimize this bound. Gągol [6] proved that if G is a connected graph with an odd number of vertices, with weights 0 or 1 on the vertices, and with no K_n minor, then Alice can guarantee herself at least $\Omega(n^{-3}\log^{-3/2} n)$ of the total weight in game T on G. His argument is tailored for that special case and is unlikely to generalize. Still, we expect the optimum value of c_n in Theorem 1.1 to be of order $\Omega(n^{-\alpha})$ for some $\alpha \geqslant 1$. The optimum value of c_3, which is the maximum fraction of the total weight Alice can secure on odd trees, lies between 1/4 and 2/5 [12].

We also present an example illustrating that the forbidden subdivision condition in Theorem 1.1 cannot be replaced by bounded expansion, which is the next restriction on a class of graphs (weaker than that of a forbidden subdivision) in the taxonomy of sparse graph classes due to Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [15].

The main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the following structural result, which may be of independent interest.

Theorem 1.2. *For every positive integer n, there is $c_n \in (0,1]$ such that if G is a weighted connected graph with no subdivision of K_n, then at least one of the following holds:*

1. *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that the total weight of all components of $G \setminus S$ except the heaviest one is at least $c_n w(G)$.*
2. *There are a set $S \subset V(G)$ with $w(S) \geqslant c_n w(G)$ and a cyclic ordering of S such that the neighborhood of every component of $G \setminus S$ consists of either a single vertex in S or two vertices in S consecutive in the cyclic order.*

In the above, $w(G)$ and $w(S)$ denote the total weights of G and S, respectively.

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 gives $c_n = \Omega(2^{-\binom{n}{2}} n^{-1})$, and again we make no effort to optimize this bound.

For game R, the two parities of the number of vertices switch their roles. Even very simple graphs with an odd number of vertices (like a 3-vertex path with all the weight in the middle) can be very bad for Alice. Micek and Walczak [11] proved that Alice can secure 1/4 of the total weight in game R played on a tree with an even number of vertices, and they conjectured that she can do as much as 1/2. This was proved by Seacrest and Seacrest [17]. They also conjectured that Alice can secure some positive constant fraction of the total weight in game R on all bipartite graphs with an even number of vertices. However, no result

of this kind is known for any natural class of graphs broader than the class of trees with an even number of vertices.

Computational aspects of games T and R were studied by Cibulka et al. [4]. They proved that finding an optimal strategy in game R is PSPACE-complete in general. Whether the same is true for game T is open. Cibulka et al. [4] also asked about the complexity of finding an optimal strategy in games T and R on trees. A polynomial-time algorithm for game T on trees was devised by Walczak [18]. The problem for game R on trees remains open.

For the rest of the paper, we focus only on game T, which we simply call the graph sharing game, as it is defined in the first paragraph. After setting up some graph-theoretic background in Section 2, we review constructions of graphs with arbitrarily small guaranteed outcome of Alice in Section 3. We prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 4 and Theorem 1.1 in Section 5.

2. Background

2.1. **Basic terminology and notation.** We write $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}^+$ to denote the sets of non-negative integers and of positive integers, respectively. We assume that the reader is acknowledged with basic terminology of graph theory. Every graph that we consider is finite and has no loops or multiple edges. The sets of vertices and edges of a graph G are denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, we denote

- by $N_G(v)$ the neighborhood of v in G,
- by $N_G[v]$ the closed neighborhood of v in G, that is, the set $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$.

For a set $S \subset V(G)$, we denote

- by $N_G(S)$ the neighborhood of S in G, that is, the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ adjacent to at least one vertex in S;
- by $N_G[S]$ the closed neighborhood of S in G, that is, the set $N_G(S) \cup S$;
- by $G[S]$ the subgraph of G induced on S;
- $G \cap S = G[V(G) \cap S]$ and $G \setminus S = G[V(G) \setminus S]$.

We omit the subscript G in N_G when the graph G is clear from the context.

A *weighted graph* is a graph G equipped with a function $w_G \colon V(G) \to [0, \infty)$ that assigns a *weight* to each vertex of G. If $S \subset V(G)$, then $w_G(S)$ denotes the sum of the weights of the vertices in S. We omit the subscript G in w_G when the graph G is clear from the context. We define $w(G) = w_G(V(G))$.

A *component* of G is a maximal connected subgraph of G. The family of components of G is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(G)$. The sets $V(C)$ over all $C \in \mathcal{C}(G)$ form a partition of $V(G)$. For a weighted graph G, we define

$$w^\star(G) = w(G) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G)} w(C).$$

For a partition $\mathcal{S}$ of $V(G)$ into non-empty connected subsets, we denote by $G/\mathcal{S}$ the graph with vertex set $\mathcal{S}$ and edge set defined as follows: $XY \in E(G/\mathcal{S})$ if and only if there are $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ such that $xy \in E(G)$.

The *reduction* of a weighted graph G to a set $S \subset V(G)$, denoted by $G\{S\}$, is the graph with vertex set S, edge set defined so that $uv \in E(G\{S\})$ if and only if there is a path P in G connecting u and v internally disjoint from S (such that



FIGURE 1. Left: a graph G, a set S of vertices circled. Right: $G\{S\}$

$V(P) \cap S = \{u, v\}$), and weight function w_G restricted to S. See Figure 1 for an illustration. If G is connected, then $G\{S\}$ is connected for any S.

We use a special definition of *cycles*, which differs from the standard one as follows: a graph consisting of a single vertex is a cycle of length 1, while a graph with two vertices joined by an edge is a cycle of length 2. This saves us from considering special degenerate cases in Sections 4 and 5.

2.2. **Subdivisions and shallow minors.** To *subdivide* an edge uv of a graph H is to replace the edge uv by a path P_{uv} between u and v of any length passing through new vertices that do not belong to $V(H)$. A graph G is a *subdivision* of a graph H if G arises from H by subdividing edges, that is, replacing edges $uv \in E(H)$ by paths P_{uv} that are internally disjoint from $V(H)$ and from each other. The relation of being a subdivision is transitive, that is, if F is a subdivision of G and G is a subdivision of H then F is also a subdivision of H. We say that a graph G contains a subdivision of K_n if G has a subgraph that is a subdivision of a complete graph on n vertices.

Theorem 2.1 (Mader [10])**.** *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is $d_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph G with no subdivision of K_n has a vertex of degree at most d_n.*

Komlós and Szemerédi [9] and independently Bollobás and Thomason [1] proved that the above holds with $d_n = O(n^2)$. Jung [7] observed that the complete bipartite graph $K_{m,m}$ contains no subdivision of K_n unless $m = \Omega(n^2)$.

A set $S \subset V(G)$ is *r-shallow* if there is $v \in S$ such that every vertex in S is within distance at most r from v in $G[S]$. Every r-shallow subset of $V(G)$ is non-empty and connected. A graph H is an *r-shallow minor* of G if H is isomorphic to a subgraph of $G/\mathcal{S}$ for some partition $\mathcal{S}$ of $V(G)$ into r-shallow subsets. Equivalently, H is an r-shallow minor of G if there is a family $\{S(v)\}_{v \in V(H)}$ of pairwise disjoint r-shallow subsets of $V(G)$ such that there is an edge between $S(u)$ and $S(v)$ in G whenever $uv \in E(H)$. A graph H is a *minor* of G if H is an r-shallow minor of G for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. If G contains a subdivision of a graph isomorphic to H, then H is a minor of G (such a graph H is also called a *topological minor* of G).

Theorem 2.2 (Nešetřil, Ossona de Mendez [13])**.** *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that if G is a graph with no subdivision of K_n, then every 1-shallow minor of G contains no subdivision of K_N.*

The *greatest reduced average degree* (*grad*) of *rank* r of a graph G, denoted by $\nabla_r(G)$, is defined by

$$\nabla_r(G) = \max_{H \in \mathcal{M}_r(G)} \frac{|E(H)|}{|V(H)|},$$

where $\mathcal{M}_r(G)$ denotes the class of all r-shallow minors of G. It is clear that $\nabla_r(G) \leqslant \nabla_s(G)$ when $r \leqslant s$. Theorem 2.1 has the following equivalent formulation: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the graphs G with no subdivision of K_n have bounded $\nabla_0(G)$. This and Theorem 2.2 easily imply that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the graphs G with no subdivision of K_n have bounded $\nabla_r(G)$. A class of graphs $\mathcal{G}$ has *bounded expansion* if there is a function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to [0,\infty)$ such that $\nabla_r(G) \leqslant f(r)$ for any $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the class of graphs with no subdivision of K_n has bounded expansion.

2.3. **Arrangeability.** For a linear ordering π of a set S, we denote

$$\pi^-(x) = \big\{y \in S\colon y <_\pi x\big\}, \qquad \pi^+(x) = \big\{y \in S\colon y >_\pi x\big\}.$$

For a graph G, a linear ordering π of $V(G)$, $v \in V(G)$, and $S \subset V(G)$, we define

$$N^-_\pi(v) = N_G(v) \cap \pi^-(v), \qquad N^+_\pi(v) = N_G(v) \cap \pi^+(v),$$
$$N^-_\pi(S) = \textstyle\bigcup_{v\in S} N^-_\pi(v).$$

A graph G is *p-arrangeable* if there is a linear ordering π of $V(G)$ with the following property: for every $v \in V(G)$, we have $|N^-_\pi(N^+_\pi(v)) \cap \pi^-(v)| \leqslant p$. The *arrangeability* of G is the minimum p such that G is p-arrangeable. This parameter has been introduced by Chen and Schelp [2], who proved that graphs with bounded arrangeability have linearly bounded Ramsey numbers.

Observation 2.3. *If G is a p-arrangeable graph and π is a linear ordering of $V(G)$ that satisfies the condition of the definition of p-arrangeability above, then*

(1) *for every $v \in V(G)$, we have $|N^-_\pi(v)| \leqslant p+1$,*
(2) *for every $v \in V(G)$, we have $|N^-_\pi(N[v]) \cap \pi^-(v)| \leqslant p^2+4p+2$.*

Proof. Let $v \in V(G)$ and suppose $N^-_\pi(v) \neq \emptyset$. Let v' be the vertex in $N^-_\pi(v)$ that is greatest with respect to π. The condition on π applied to v' yields $|N^-_\pi(v) \cap \pi^-(v')| \leqslant p$, which implies (1). Now, for every $v \in V(G)$, we have

$$N^-_\pi(N[v]) \cap \pi^-(v) \;=\; N^-_\pi(N^-_\pi(v)) \;\cup\; N^-_\pi(v) \;\cup \big(N^-_\pi(N^+_\pi(v)) \cap \pi^-(v)\big),$$
$$\begin{aligned}|N^-_\pi(N[v]) \cap \pi^-(v)| &= |N^-_\pi(N^-_\pi(v))| + |N^-_\pi(v)| + |N^-_\pi(N^+_\pi(v)) \cap \pi^-(v)| \\ &\leqslant (p+1)^2 + (p+1) + p = p^2+4p+2,\end{aligned}$$

where the first term is bounded using an iteration of (1). This proves (2). □

Theorem 2.4 (Rödl, Thomas [16])**.** *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is $p_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph with no subdivision of K_n is p_n-arrangeable.*

Rödl and Thomas proved the above with $p_n = O(n^8)$. This was improved by Dvořák [5] to $O(n^6)$. Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [14] proved that the arrangeability of a graph G is bounded in terms of $\nabla_1(G)$. In particular, the arrangeability is bounded in classes of graphs with bounded expansion.

3. Examples

First, we recall some known constructions of weighted connected graphs on which Alice's guaranteed outcome in the graph sharing game can be an arbitrarily small fraction of the total weight. Then, we show how to modify such constructions so as to obtain graphs with the same property that are very sparse (in particular, have bounded expansion).



FIGURE 2. Examples of G_5



FIGURE 3. H_3; to obtain H_3', subdivide each edge $b_i c_X$ by a large even number of new vertices of weight 0

Example 3.1 ([12]). Let G_n be a weighted graph with vertex set $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ such that the subgraph of G_n induced on $\{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ is connected and the only neighbor of each a_i is b_i. Each a_i has weight 1, and each b_i has weight 0. The total weight is n. See Figure 2 for an illustration.

Alice has no strategy to gather more than 1 from G_n. Indeed, she starts with some a_i (collecting 1) or b_i, and clever Bob responds by taking the other of a_i, b_i. In all subsequent moves Alice is forced to take some vertex of $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, say b_j, and Bob responds by playing a_j.

Example 3.2 ([12]). Let H_n be a weighted graph with vertex set $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n\} \cup \{c_X \colon X \subset \{1, \ldots, n\},\ X \neq \emptyset\}$, which has size $2n + 2^n - 1$. The neighborhoods of the vertices are: $N(a_i) = \{b_i\}$, $N(b_i) = \{a_i\} \cup \{c_X \colon i \in X\}$, $N(c_X) = \{b_i \colon i \in X\}$. Each a_i has weight 1, and all other vertices have weight 0. The total weight is again n. See Figure 3 for an illustration.

Again, Alice has no strategy to gather more than 1 from H_n. Suppose that Alice starts with a_{i_1} or b_{i_1}. Bob responds by taking the other of a_{i_1}, b_{i_1}. Let $V_1 = \{a_j, b_j \colon j \neq i_1\} \cup \{c_X \colon i_1 \notin X\}$. If $n-1 > 0$, then the subgraph induced on V_1 is isomorphic to H_{n-1}. In particular, $|V_1|$ is odd and $|V \setminus V_1|$ is even. Since b_{i_1} has been taken, all vertices in $V \setminus V_1$ are available. Therefore, as long as Alice plays in $V(H_n) \setminus V_1$, Bob can respond also in $V \setminus V_1$. Alice is eventually forced to enter V_1, which is possible only by taking some b_{i_2}, and Bob immediately follows with a_{i_2}. If $n - 2 > 0$, then we define $V_2 = \{a_j, b_j \colon j \neq i_1, i_2\} \cup \{c_X \colon i_1, i_2 \notin X\}$ and continue with the same argument, and so on. This way Bob wins all of

$a_1, \dots, a_n$ except a_{i_1}. If Alice starts with some c_X, then Bob takes any available b_{i_1}, and the same argument shows that Bob can take all of $a_1, \dots, a_n$ except a_{i_1}.

Example 3.1 shows that very simple trees (caterpillars or subdivided stars) with an even number of vertices can be arbitrarily bad for Alice. Example 3.2 shows that there are also (quite dense) graphs with an odd number of vertices that are arbitrarily bad for Alice. In particular, the graph H_n contains a subdivision of K_n in which every edge is subdivided by one new vertex. We can obtain much sparser examples with the help of the following proposition, whose easy but technical proof is omitted.

Proposition 3.3. *Let G be a weighted connected graph such that any two vertices with positive weight are at distance at least 3 in G. If H is a graph obtained from G by subdividing every edge uv with $w(u) = w(v) = 0$ an even number of times, then the guaranteed outcome of Alice on H is equal to the one on G.*

Proposition 3.3 allows us to turn the graphs from Example 3.2 (or any other family of graphs with similar properties) into a family of much sparser graphs with an odd number of vertices and with the same guaranteed outcome of Alice.

Example 3.4. Fix a non-decreasing function $f\colon \mathbb{N} \to (1, \infty)$ with $f(r) \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$. Let H_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ denote the graphs constructed in Example 3.2. Let $z_n = \max_{r\in\mathbb{N}} \nabla_r(H_n)$. This is a finite number, as H_n has a bounded number of minors. It follows that $\nabla_r(H'_n) \leqslant z_n$ for every subdivision H'_n of H_n and every $r \in \mathbb{N}$. For any fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$, if we subdivide each edge $b_i c_X$ of H_n by enough many new vertices, thus obtaining a graph H'_n, then the ratio of the number of vertices of degree 2 to the number of all vertices in every r-shallow minor of H'_n is high enough to guarantee $\nabla_r(H'_n) \leqslant f(r)$. Let H'_n be a graph obtained from H_n by subdividing every edge $b_i c_X$ of H_n by an even number of new vertices large enough to guarantee $\nabla_r(H'_n) \leqslant \min\{z_n, f(r)\}$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that the graphs H_n have expansion bounded by f. Since $|V(H_n)|$ is odd, $|V(H'_n)|$ is odd as well. The weight of all subdividing vertices is set to 0 so that $w(H'_n) = n$.

Alice has no strategy to gather more than 1 from H'_n. This follows from Proposition 3.3 or can be proved directly by a modification of the argument for H_n used in Example 3.2.

Proposition 3.3 and Example 3.4 motivate the assumption that G contains no subdivision of a fixed complete graph in Theorem 1.1. Indeed, if we want to exclude graphs on which Alice's guaranteed outcome is not greater than $1/n$ of the total weight, then we need to exclude at least the graph H_n from Example 3.2 and all its subdivisions of the special kind considered in Proposition 3.3, including the graphs H'_n from Example 3.4.

4. Structural properties of weighted connected graphs

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 1.2. Namely, for a suitable constant $c_n > 0$, we show that every weighted connected graph G with no subdivision of K_n contains at least one of the following structures:

- a connected set S of vertices such that $w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant c_n w(G)$,
- a set S of vertices such that $G\{S\}$ is a cycle and $w(S) \geqslant c_n w(G)$,

see Corollary 4.8. This provides a base for the strategies of Alice developed in the next section.

First, we show that every weighted connected graph G contains at least one of the structures above or a connected set S of vertices with $w(N(S)) \geqslant c_n w(G)$, see Corollaries 4.4 and 4.6. Then, we reduce the latter case to the first two for graphs with forbidden subdivision of K_n.

4.1. **Hamiltonian graphs.** The following lemma deals with *oriented graphs*, that is, graphs in which every edge is assigned an orientation. An *oriented path* or *cycle* is a path or cycle in which the orientations of edges agree with the order of vertices along the path or cycle.

For an oriented path P, let $<_P$ denote the order of vertices along P. For vertices u and v of an oriented path P, we define

$$[u,v]_P = \big\{x \in V(P)\colon u \leqslant_P x \leqslant_P v\big\},$$
$$[u,v)_P = \big\{x \in V(P)\colon u \leqslant_P x <_P v\big\},$$
$$(u,v)_P = \big\{x \in V(P)\colon u <_P x <_P v\big\}.$$

An oriented path P in an oriented graph G is *Hamiltonian* if $V(P) = V(G)$. A vertex x of an oriented graph G with a Hamiltonian path P is *P-covered* by an edge $uv \in E(G)$ if $x \in (u,v)_P$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be an acyclic oriented graph with at least two vertices and with a Hamiltonian path P starting at s and ending at t. If all vertices in $V(G) \setminus \{s,t\}$ are P-covered, then there are two paths Q_0 and Q_1 in G starting at s, ending at t, and having no other vertices in common.*

Proof. Construct inductively a sequence $v_0, \ldots, v_n$ of vertices of G as follows:

- let v_0 be greatest in $<_P$ such that $sv_0 \in E(G)$;
- for $i \geqslant 1$, let v_i be greatest in $<_P$ such that there is $u \in [s, v_{i-1})_P$ with $uv_i \in E(G)$;
- if $v_i = t$, then let $n = i$ and the construction is done.

For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, since v_{i-1} is P-covered, there is always a candidate for v_i, and $v_{i-1} <_P v_i$. Set $u_0 = s$ so that $u_0v_0 \in E(G)$, and choose vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ of G so that $u_i \in [s, v_{i-1})_P$ and $u_iv_i \in E(G)$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$. For $2 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, it follows that $u_i \in [v_{i-2}, v_{i-1})_P$, because $u_i <_P v_{i-2} <_P v_{i-1} <_P v_i$ would contradict the choice of v_{i-1}. Therefore, the intervals $[s,u_1]_P$, $[v_{i-2},u_i]_P$ for $2 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, and $[v_{n-1},t]_P$ are non-empty and pairwise disjoint. For $k \in \{0,1\}$, let Q_k be the path obtained from P by replacing, for each i with $0 \leqslant i \leqslant n$ and $i \equiv k \pmod 2$, the subpath induced on $[u_i,v_i]_P$ by the single-edge path u_iv_i in G. It follows that the only common vertices of the paths Q_0 and Q_1 are s and t. □

For vertices u and v of an oriented cycle H, we denote by $(u,v)_H$

- the set of internal vertices of the path in H from u to v if $u \neq v$,
- the set $V(H) \setminus \{u\}$ if $u = v$.

We also denote

$$[u,v)_H = \{u\} \cup (u,v)_H, \qquad (u,v]_H = (u,v)_H \cup \{v\}.$$

An (oriented) cycle H in an (oriented) graph G is *Hamiltonian* if $V(H) = V(G)$. A vertex x of an oriented graph G with a Hamiltonian cycle H is *H-covered* by an edge $uv \in E(G)$ if $x \in (u,v)_H$.

Recall that we consider a single-vertex graph and a graph consisting of two vertices joined by an edge as (unoriented) cycles of length 1 and 2, respectively.

Lemma 4.2. *There is $c \in (0,1]$ such that every weighted graph G containing a Hamiltonian cycle H satisfies at least one of the following conditions:*

(1) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that*
$$w^\star(H \setminus S) \geqslant cw(G).$$
(2) *There is a set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $G\{S\}$ is a cycle and*
$$w(S) \geqslant cw(G).$$

Proof. We show that it is enough to set

$$c = 1/5. \tag{4.1}$$

Let G be a weighted graph containing a Hamiltonian cycle H. If G has no more than 3 vertices, then (2) holds for $S = V(G)$. If some edge $uv \in E(G)$ satisfies $w^\star(H \setminus \{u,v\}) \geqslant cw(G)$, then (1) holds for $S = \{u,v\}$. Therefore, for the remainder of the proof, assume that G has at least 4 vertices and every edge $uv \in E(G)$ satisfies

$$w^\star(H \setminus \{u,v\}) < cw(G). \tag{4.2}$$

Suppose that we find two connected sets $S_0, S_1 \subset V(G)$ such that

$$w(S_0 \cap S_1) < cw(G), \tag{4.3}$$
$$w(C) < cw(G) \quad \text{for } C \in \mathcal{C}(H \setminus S_k) \text{ and } k \in \{0,1\}. \tag{4.4}$$

By (4.3), we have

$$w(S_0) + w(S_1) = w(S_0 \cup S_1) + w(S_0 \cap S_1) < (1+c)w(G).$$

If we choose $k \in \{0,1\}$ so that $w(S_k) \leqslant w(S_{1-k})$, then the above yields

$$w(S_k) < \tfrac{1}{2}(1+c)w(G). \tag{4.5}$$

To conclude, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w^\star(H \setminus S_k) &= w(H \setminus S_k) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(H \setminus S_k)} w(C) \\ &> w(G) - \tfrac{1}{2}(1+c)w(G) - cw(G) && \text{by (4.5) and (4.4)} \\ &= cw(G) && \text{by (4.1).} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (1) holds for $S = S_k$.

To complete the proof, we show how to find two connected sets $S_0, S_1 \subset V(G)$ satisfying (4.3) and (4.4) or a set $S \subset V(G)$ satisfying the conclusion (2) of the lemma.

We orient the edges of G as follows. First, we orient the cycle H in any of the two directions. Then, we assign to every edge in $E(G) \setminus E(H)$ an orientation uv so that $w((u,v)_H) \leqslant w((v,u)_H)$. This and (4.2) imply that every oriented edge $uv \in E(G) \setminus E(H)$ satisfies

$$w((u,v)_H) = w^\star(H \setminus \{u,v\}) < cw(G). \tag{4.6}$$

From now on, we consider G as an oriented graph and H as an oriented Hamiltonian cycle in G.

Let U be the set of vertices of G that are not H-covered. Suppose $U \neq \emptyset$. Let $u_0, \dots, u_{n-1}$ be the vertices in U in the order they occur along H, and let $u_n = u_0$. For every edge $xy \in E(G)$, there is an index $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $x \in [u_i, u_{i+1})_H$ and $y \in (u_i, u_{i+1}]_H$, as otherwise xy would cover a vertex from U. It follows that $G\{U\}$ is the cycle consisting of $u_0, \dots, u_{n-1}$ in this order. If $w(U) \geqslant cw(G)$, then (2) holds for $S = U$. Thus assume

$$w(U) < cw(G). \tag{4.7}$$

For every u_i, create a new vertex u_i' and redirect all edges of G that end at u_i sending them to u_i'. Thus a new oriented graph G' is obtained. It splits into k pairwise disjoint acyclic oriented graphs $G_0', \dots, G_{k-1}'$, each G_i' containing a Hamiltonian path from u_i to u_{i+1}' going through all vertices in $(u_i, u_{i+1})_H$. Every vertex $x \in V(G_i') \setminus \{u_i, u_{i+1}'\}$ is H-covered by an edge corresponding to the one that originally H-covers x in G. Therefore, by Lemma 4.1, each G_i' has two paths Q_i^0 and Q_i^1 from u_i to u_{i+1}' containing no other common vertices. For $k \in \{0, 1\}$, let C_k be the cycle in G obtained by taking the union of all Q_i^k and gluing each pair u_i, u_i' back into the single vertex u_i. Let $S_k = V(C_k)$. It follows that $S_0 \cap S_1 = U$, and hence (4.3) follows from (4.7). Moreover, every component of $H \setminus S_k$ is entirely contained in $(u, v)_H$ for some edge $uv \in E(C_k)$, and hence (4.4) follows from (4.6). Since S_0 and S_1 are the vertex sets of cycles in G, they are connected in G.

Now, suppose $U = \emptyset$. Choose any vertex $v \in V(G)$. Redirect all edges that H-cover v sending them to v. Thus a new oriented graph $G^\star$ with the same Hamiltonian cycle H is obtained. Every redirected edge uv still satisfies (4.6). The vertex v is not H-covered in $G^\star$. Moreover, all vertices not H-covered in $G^\star$ are H-covered in G by a common edge. Therefore, by (4.6), the set $U^\star$ of vertices that are not H-covered in $G^\star$ satisfies

$$w(U^\star) < cw(G). \tag{4.8}$$

We apply the same argument as for the case $U \neq \emptyset$, but with $G^\star$ and $U^\star$ in place of G and U and using (4.8) instead of (4.7). This gives us two cycles C_0 and C_1 in $G^\star$ with vertex sets S_0 and S_1, respectively, which satisfy (4.3) and (4.4). Moreover, each C_k can contain only one edge from $E(G^\star) \setminus E(G)$, namely, the one entering v. This shows that each S_k is connected in G. □

Lemma 4.3. *There is $c \in (0, 1]$ such that every weighted graph G containing a Hamiltonian cycle H and every connected set $A \subset V(G)$ satisfy at least one of the following conditions:*

(1) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A \subset S$ and*
$$w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant cw^\star(H \setminus A).$$
(2) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A \subset S$ and*
$$w(N(S)) \geqslant cw^\star(H \setminus A).$$

Proof. We show that it is enough to set

$$c = 1/5. \tag{4.9}$$



FIGURE 4. Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.3: $A = \{u, v\}$, $\mathcal{B}_0 = \{B_1, B_3, B_4, B_6, B_8, B_9\}$, $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{B_2, B_5, B_7\}$

Let G be a weighted graph containing a Hamiltonian cycle H, and let A be a connected subset of $V(G)$. If $H \setminus A$ is connected, then $w^\star(H \setminus A) = 0$ and the conclusion holds trivially. Thus assume that $H \setminus A$ has at least two components. Let P be an oriented Hamiltonian path in G obtained by orienting H in any of the two directions and then removing the edge going out of an arbitrarily chosen vertex of A. Thus the last vertex of P belongs to A. We partition the set $V(G) \setminus A$ into *blocks* $B_1, \ldots, B_n$, which are intervals in the order $<_P$. We construct them one by one in the order of their indices as follows. Let B_i be the interval $[f_i, u_i)_P$ such that

- f_i is least in $<_P$ such that $f_i \notin A \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{i-1}$,
- u_i is least in $<_P$ such that $f_i <_P u_i$ and $u_i \in N[A \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{i-1}]$.

If $u_i \notin A$, then $u_i = f_{i+1}$. Now, we partition the family $\{B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$ of all blocks into two subfamilies $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ as follows. We process the blocks in the order of their indices. We put B_i into $\mathcal{B}_0$ if $u_i \in N[A]$ or u_i is adjacent to at least one of $B_1, \ldots, B_{i-1}$ that has been already put into $\mathcal{B}_1$. Otherwise, we put B_i into $\mathcal{B}_1$. See Figure 4. It follows from the presented construction that

(a) $f_i \in N(A)$ or f_i is adjacent to at least one block of $\{B_1, \ldots, B_{i-1}\} \cap \mathcal{B}_0$ and at least one block of $\{B_1, \ldots, B_{i-1}\} \cap \mathcal{B}_1$;
(b) no vertex in $B_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ is adjacent to $A \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{i-1}$.

For $k \in \{0, 1\}$, define

$$A'_k = A \cup \bigcup \mathcal{B}_{1-k}, \qquad F_k = \{f_i \colon B_i \in \mathcal{B}_k\}, \qquad A''_k = A'_k \cup F_k.$$

It follows from (a) that $G[A'_k]$ is connected—every block $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{1-k}$ is connected to A directly or through blocks from $\{B_1, \ldots, B_{i-1}\} \cap \mathcal{B}_{1-k}$. It also follows from (a) that $F_k \subset N(A'_k)$. Therefore, if

$$w(F_k) \geqslant cw^\star(H \setminus A),$$

then

$$w(N(A'_k)) \geqslant cw^\star(H \setminus A)$$

and hence (2) holds for $S = A'_k$. Thus assume

$$w(F_k) < cw^\star(H \setminus A) \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{4.10}$$

Since $F_k \subset N(A'_k)$ and $G[A'_k]$ is connected, $G[A''_k]$ is connected too. If

$$w^\star(G \setminus A''_k) \geqslant cw^\star(H \setminus A),$$

then (1) holds for $S = A''_k$. Thus assume

$$w^\star(G \setminus A''_k) < cw^\star(H \setminus A) \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{4.11}$$

By (b), the components of $G \setminus A''_k$ are precisely the subgraphs $G[B_i \setminus \{f_i\}]$ for $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_k$. Let C_k be a maximum weight set of the form $B_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ with $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_k$. Since $\{F_0, V(G) \setminus A''_0, F_1, V(G) \setminus A''_1\}$ is a partition of $V(G) \setminus A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &w(F_0) + w^\star(G \setminus A''_0) + w(C_0) + w(F_1) + w^\star(G \setminus A''_1) + w(C_1) \\ &\quad = w(F_0) + w(G \setminus A''_0) + w(F_1) + w(G \setminus A''_1) \\ &\quad = w(G \setminus A) = w^\star(H \setminus A) + \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\gamma = \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(H \setminus A)} w(C).$$

The above together with (4.10) and (4.11) implies

$$\begin{aligned} w(C_0) + w(C_1) &> (1 - 4c) w^\star(H \setminus A) + \gamma \\ &= c w^\star(H \setminus A) + \gamma \qquad \text{by (4.9).} \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Since each C_k is contained in one component of $H \setminus A$, we have

$$w(C_k) \leqslant \gamma \quad \text{for } k \in \{0, 1\}, \tag{4.13}$$

If C_0 and C_1 are contained in the same component of $H \setminus A$, then we have

$$w(C_0) + w(C_1) \leqslant \gamma,$$

which contradicts (4.12). Thus C_0 and C_1 are contained in distinct components of $H \setminus A$. It follows that $H \setminus (C_0 \cup C_1)$ consists of two components each containing a vertex from A. This implies that $G \setminus (C_0 \cup C_1)$ is connected, as it contains the whole connected set A. Moreover, $G[C_0]$ and $G[C_1]$ are precisely the components of $G[C_0 \cup C_1]$, and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} w^\star(G[C_0 \cup C_1]) &= w(C_0) + w(C_1) - \max\{w(C_0), w(C_1)\} \\ &\geqslant w(C_0) + w(C_1) - \gamma && \text{by (4.13)} \\ &> c w^\star(H \setminus A) && \text{by (4.12).} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (1) is satisfied for $S = V(G) \setminus (C_0 \cup C_1)$. □

Corollary 4.4. *There is $c \in (0, 1]$ such that every weighted graph G containing a Hamiltonian cycle satisfies at least one of the following conditions:*

(1) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that*
$$w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant c w(G).$$
(2) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that*
$$w(N(S)) \geqslant c w(G).$$
(3) *There is a set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $G\{S\}$ is a cycle and*
$$w(S) \geqslant c w(G).$$

Proof. We show that it is enough to set $c = c'c''$, where c' and c'' are constants claimed by Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, respectively.

Let G be a weighted graph containing a Hamiltonian cycle H. By Lemma 4.2, at least one of the following holds:

(1′) There is a connected set $A \subset V(G)$ such that
$$w^\star(H \setminus A) \geqslant c' w(G).$$

($2'$) There is a set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $G\{S\}$ is a cycle and

$$w(S) \geqslant c'w(G).$$

If ($2'$) holds, then it directly implies (3). Thus assume ($1'$). By Lemma 4.3, at least one of the following holds:

($1''$) There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A \subset S$ and

$$w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant c''w^\star(H \setminus A) \geqslant cw(G).$$

($2''$) There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A \subset S$ and

$$w(N(S)) \geqslant c''w^\star(H \setminus A) \geqslant cw(G).$$

Hence (1) or (2) follows, respectively. □

4.2. **General graphs.**

Lemma 4.5. *Every weighted connected graph G contains a cycle H such that every component of $G \setminus V(H)$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2}w(G)$.*

Proof. Let G be a weighted connected graph. A tree T is a *spanning tree* of G if $V(T) = V(G)$ and $E(T) \subset E(G)$. For a spanning tree T of G and an edge uv of G, let T_{uv} denote the set of vertices of the unique path in T connecting u and v. Choose an arbitrary vertex r of G. A standard depth-first search procedure started from r constructs a spanning tree T of G with the following property:

(4.14) for every edge xy of G, either $x \in T_{ry}$ or $y \in T_{rx}$.

We find a vertex v in T such that every component of $T \setminus \{v\}$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2}w(T)$. This can be done as follows. Pick any vertex $v_0 \in V(T)$. Then, for each i, either v_i satisfies the condition for v or exactly one component C of $T \setminus \{v_i\}$ has weight greater than $\frac{1}{2}w(T)$. In the latter case, choose the only neighbor of v_i in C to be v_{i+1}. This way, a simple path $v_0v_1\dots$ is constructed. It cannot be infinite, so a vertex v such that every component of $T \setminus \{v\}$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2}w(T)$ is finally found.

If $v = r$, then no edge of G connects two distinct components of $T \setminus \{v\}$, as such an edge would contradict (4.14). In this case, the conclusion follows by choosing $H = \{v\}$. Now, assume $v \neq r$. Let C be the component of $T \setminus \{v\}$ containing r, and let $C^\star$ be the union of all other components of $T \setminus \{v\}$. By (4.14), all edges of G connecting two distinct components of $T \setminus \{v\}$ go between C and $C^\star$. Let xy be an edge of G connecting $x \in V(C)$ and $y \in V(C^\star)$ and minimizing the distance between r and x in T. It follows that $x \in T_{rv}$ as otherwise xy would contradict (4.14). Every other edge $x'y' \in E(G)$ connecting $x' \in V(C)$ and $y' \in V(C^\star)$ also satisfies $x' \in T_{rv}$, and therefore, by the choice of x, it satisfies $x' \in T_{xv}$. This shows that the vertex set of every component of $G \setminus T_{xv}$ is entirely contained in one component of $T \setminus \{v\}$. Let H be the cycle formed by the edge xy and the unique path in T between x and y. Since $T_{xv} \subset V(H)$, the vertex set of every component of $G \setminus V(H)$ is entirely contained in one component of $T \setminus \{v\}$. Therefore, since every component of $T \setminus \{v\}$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2}w(T)$, every component of $G \setminus V(H)$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2}w(G)$. □

Corollary 4.6. *There is a constant $c \in (0, 1]$ such that every weighted connected graph G satisfies at least one of the following conditions:*

(1) *There is a connected set* $S \subset V(G)$ *such that*

$$w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant cw(G).$$

(2) *There is a connected set* $S \subset V(G)$ *such that*

$$w(N(S)) \geqslant cw(G).$$

(3) *There is a set* $S \subset V(G)$ *such that* $G\{S\}$ *is a cycle and*

$$w(S) \geqslant cw(G).$$

Proof. Let $c' \in (0,1]$ be a constant claimed by Corollary 4.4. Set

$$c = \frac{c'}{2(1+c')}.$$

It follows that

$$c'(\tfrac{1}{2} - c) = c. \tag{4.15}$$

We show that this is enough for the conclusion of the lemma.

Let G be a weighted connected graph. By Lemma 4.5, there is a cycle H in G such that every component of $G \setminus V(H)$ has weight at most $\frac{1}{2}w(G)$. If $w(H) \leqslant (\frac{1}{2} - c)w(G)$, then the conclusion (1) with $S = V(H)$ follows:

$$w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant w(G \setminus S) - \tfrac{1}{2}w(G) = \tfrac{1}{2}w(G) - w(H) \geqslant cw(G).$$

Thus assume $w(H) > (\frac{1}{2} - c)w(G)$. Let $G' = G\{V(H)\}$. By (4.15), we have

$$c'w(G') = c'w(H) > c'(\tfrac{1}{2} - c)w(G) = cw(G).$$

By Corollary 4.4 and by the above, at least one of the following holds:

(1′) There is a connected set $S' \subset V(G')$ such that

$$w^\star(G' \setminus S') \geqslant c'w(G') > cw(G).$$

(2′) There is a connected set $S' \subset V(G')$ such that

$$w(N_{G'}(S')) \geqslant c'w(G') > cw(G).$$

(3′) There is a set $S' \subset V(G')$ such that $G'\{S'\}$ is a cycle and

$$w(S') \geqslant c'w(G') > cw(G).$$

We show that each of the statements (1′)–(3′) above implies the corresponding statement (1)–(3) in the conclusion of the lemma.

Suppose that (1′) holds. Let S be the set of all vertices of G reachable in G by a path starting in S' and containing no other vertex of G'. Clearly, $S \cap V(G') = S'$. If uv is an edge of $G'[S']$, then the whole path from u to v in G witnessing the edge uv in G' belongs to S. Therefore, since $G'[S']$ is connected, $G[S]$ is connected too. Moreover, any two vertices of $G' \setminus S'$ are connected by a path in $G' \setminus S'$ if and only if they are connected by a path in $G \setminus S$. Consequently, if C is a component of $G \setminus S$, then $G' \cap V(C)$ is a component of $G' \setminus S'$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} w(C) &= w(C \cap V(G')) + w(C \setminus V(G')) \\ &\leqslant \max_{C' \in \mathcal{C}(G' \setminus S')} w(C') + w\big(G \setminus (S \cup V(G'))\big). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that (1) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} w^\star(G \smallsetminus S) &= w(G \smallsetminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \smallsetminus S)} w(C) \\ &\geqslant w(G' \smallsetminus S') + w\big(G \smallsetminus (S \cup V(G'))\big) \\ &\qquad - \max_{C' \in \mathcal{C}(G' \smallsetminus S')} w(C') - w\big(G \smallsetminus (S \cup V(G'))\big) \\ &= w^\star(G' \smallsetminus S') > cw(G). \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose that (2′) holds. Again, let S be the set of all vertices in G reachable in G by a path starting in S' and containing no other vertex of G'. As before, $S \cap V(G') = S'$ and $G[S]$ is connected. Moreover, if uv is an edge in G' such that $u \in S'$ and $v \in N_{G'}(S')$, then $v \in N_G(S)$, as the entire path from u to v in G witnessing the edge uv in G' except the vertex v is included in S. Therefore, $N_{G'}(S') \subset N_G(S)$ and hence (2) follows:

$$w(N_G(S)) \geqslant w(N_{G'}(S')) > cw(G).$$

Finally, suppose that (3′) holds. Let $S = S'$. We have

$$w(S) = w(S') > cw(G).$$

Moreover, $G\{S\} = G'\{S'\}$ and hence (3) follows. □

4.3. **Graphs with a forbidden subdivision.** Recall that a graph G contains a subdivision of a graph H if G has a subgraph F that arises from H by replacing every edge $uv \in E(H)$ by a path F_{uv} between u and v so that the paths F_{uv} are internally disjoint from $V(H)$ and from each other. Hence the vertices of H maintain their identity in the subdivision and, in particular, $V(H) \subset V(G)$. This subtlety is important for the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $m \in \{0, \dots, \binom{n}{2}\}$, there is $c_{n,m} \in (0, 1]$ such that every weighted connected graph G and every connected non-empty proper subset A of $V(G)$ satisfy at least one of the following conditions:*

(1) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A \subset S$ and*

$$w(N(A) \smallsetminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \smallsetminus S)} w(C \cap N(A)) \geqslant c_{n,m} w(N(A)).$$

(2) *There is a vertex $v \in N(A)$ such that*

$$w(v) \geqslant c_{n,m} w(N(A)).$$

(3) *There is a graph H with n vertices and m edges such that $V(H) \subset N(A)$ and $G \smallsetminus A$ contains a subdivision of H.*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. If $n = 1$, then (3) holds trivially, so assume $n \geqslant 2$. The proof goes by induction on m. If $m = 0$, then it is enough to set

$$c_{n,0} = \frac{1}{n-1}.$$

Indeed, let G be a weighted connected graph and A be a connected non-empty proper subset of $V(G)$. If $|N(A)| \leqslant n - 1$, then the heaviest vertex in $N(A)$ satisfies (2). If $|N(A)| \geqslant n$, then $G \smallsetminus A$ contains a subgraph H with n vertices and no edges. Thus assume $1 \leqslant m \leqslant \binom{n}{2}$. We show that it is enough to set

$$\beta_{n,m} = \frac{c_{n,m-1}}{2(1 + c_{n,m-1})}, \tag{4.16}$$

$$c_{n,m} = \frac{\beta_{n,m}}{1+\beta_{n,m}}. \tag{4.17}$$

Let G be a weighted connected graph and A be a connected non-empty proper subset of $V(G)$. If every component C of $G \setminus A$ satisfies

$$w(C \cap N(A)) \leqslant (1-c_{n,m})w(N(A)),$$

then (1) holds for $S = A$. Thus assume there is a component C of $G \setminus A$ with

$$w(C \cap N(A)) > (1-c_{n,m})w(N(A)).$$

Define $B = V(C) \cap N(A)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w(B) &> (1-c_{n,m})w(N(A)) \\ &= \frac{1}{1+\beta_{n,m}} w(N(A)) \qquad \text{by (4.17).} \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Choose any $v_0 \in B$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let B_i be the set of vertices at distance i from v_0 in $C\{B\}$. Let k be the greatest index for which $B_k \neq \emptyset$. Clearly, the sets $B_0, \ldots, B_k$ form a partition of B. Moreover, B_i and B_j are not adjacent in $C\{B\}$ whenever $|i-j| \geqslant 2$. Choose $j \in \{0, \ldots, k\}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} w(B_0 \cup \ldots \cup B_{j-1}) &\leqslant \tfrac{1}{2} w(B), \\ w(B_{j+1} \cup \ldots \cup B_k) &\leqslant \tfrac{1}{2} w(B). \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Suppose

$$w(B_j) \leqslant (\tfrac{1}{2} - \beta_{n,m}) w(B).$$

It follows from the above and (4.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} w(B_0 \cup \ldots \cup B_{j-1}) &= w(B) - w(B_j \cup B_{j+1} \cup \ldots \cup B_k) \geqslant \beta_{n,m} w(B), \\ w(B_{j+1} \cup \ldots \cup B_k) &= w(B) - w(B_0 \cup \ldots \cup B_{j-1} \cup B_j) \geqslant \beta_{n,m} w(B). \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Since there is no path in G connecting $B_0 \cup \ldots \cup B_{j-1}$ and $B_{j+1} \cup \ldots \cup B_k$ that avoids $A \cup B_j$, the vertex set of every component of $G \setminus (A \cup B_j)$ is disjoint from $B_0 \cup \ldots \cup B_{j-1}$ or $B_{j+1} \cup \ldots \cup B_k$. Thus (1) follows for $S = A \cup B_j$:

$$\begin{aligned} w(N(A) \setminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)} w(C \cap N(A)) &\geqslant \beta_{n,m} w(B) && \text{by (4.20)} \\ &> c_{n,m} w(N(A)) && \text{by (4.18) and (4.17).} \end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider the case

$$w(B_j) > (\tfrac{1}{2} - \beta_{n,m}) w(B). \tag{4.21}$$

Every vertex in B_j is reachable in C from v_0 by a path avoiding all other vertices from B_j. Let A' be the set of vertices of G reachable in G from A by a path entirely disjoint from B_j. It follows that $A \subset A' \subset V(G) \setminus B_j$ and

$$N(A') = B_j = N(A) \setminus A'. \tag{4.22}$$

Since $G[A]$ is connected, $G[A']$ is connected too. By the induction hypothesis, at least one of the following holds:

($1'$) There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A' \subset S$ and

$$w(B_j \setminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)} w(C \cap B_j) \geqslant c_{n,m-1} w(B_j).$$

($2'$) There is a vertex $v \in B_j$ such that

$$w(v) \geqslant c_{n,m-1} w(B_j).$$

(3′) There is a graph H' with n vertices and $m-1$ edges such that $V(H') \subset B_j$ and $G \setminus A'$ contains a subdivision of H'.

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n,m-1} w(B_j) &> \beta_{n,m} w(B) && \text{by (4.21) and (4.16)} \\ &> c_{n,m} w(N(A)) && \text{by (4.18) and (4.17).} \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

If (1′) holds, then by (4.22) we have $B_j \setminus S = N(A) \setminus S$ and $V(C) \cap B_j = V(C) \cap N(A)$ for every $C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)$. This and (4.23) imply (1) for the same set S. If (2′) holds, then by (4.23) we have (2) for the same vertex v. So suppose that (3′) holds.

Let u and v be any two vertices of H' such that $uv \notin E(H')$. To prove (3), we show that $G \setminus A$ contains a subdivision of the graph H with $V(H) = V(H')$ and $E(H) = E(H') \cup \{uv\}$. Let F' be a subdivision of H' in $G \setminus A'$ claimed by (3′). Since $u, v \in B_j$, the vertices u and v are reachable in $G \setminus A$ from v_0 by paths P_u and P_v, respectively, avoiding all other vertices from B_j. Let P be the path connecting u and v in $P_u \cup P_v$. It follows from the definition of A' that $V(P_u) \setminus \{u\} \subset A'$ and $V(P_v) \setminus \{v\} \subset A'$, and thus $V(P) \setminus \{u, v\} \subset A'$. In particular, P is internally disjoint from F'. This shows that $F' \cup P$ is a subdivision of H in $G \setminus A$. □

Corollary 4.8 (Theorem 1.2 rephrased)**.** *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is $c_n \in (0, 1]$ such that every weighted connected graph G containing no subdivision of K_n satisfies at least one of the following conditions:*

(1) *There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that*

$$w^\star(G \setminus S) \geqslant c_n w(G).$$

(2) *There is a set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $G\{S\}$ is a cycle and*

$$w(S) \geqslant c_n w(G).$$

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. We show that it is enough to set $c_n = c' c''_n$, where c' is a constant claimed by Corollary 4.6, and c''_n is a constant claimed by Lemma 4.7 for $m = \binom{n}{2}$.

Let G be a weighted connected graph containing no subdivision of K_n. It follows from Corollary 4.6 that (1) or (2) holds or there is a connected set $A \subset V(G)$ such that

$$w(N(A)) \geqslant c' w(G).$$

In the latter case, by Lemma 4.7, at least one of the following holds:

(1′) There is a connected set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $A \subset S$ and

$$w(N(A) \setminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)} w(C \cap N(A)) \geqslant c''_n w(N(A)) \geqslant c_n w(G).$$

(2′) There is a vertex $v \in N(A)$ such that

$$w(v) \geqslant c''_n w(N(A)) \geqslant c_n w(G).$$

The third case of Lemma 4.7 is excluded by the assumption that G contains no subdivision of K_n. If $(1')$ holds, then (1) follows for the same set S:

$$\begin{aligned} w^\star(G \setminus S) &= w(G \setminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)} w(C) \\ &\geqslant w(N(A) \setminus S) - \max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)} w(C \cap N(A)) \\ &\geqslant c_n w(G). \end{aligned}$$

If $(2')$ holds, then (2) follows for $S = \{v\}$. □

Solving the recurrence formula for $c_{n,m}$ in the proof of Lemma 4.7 gives $c_{n,m} = \Theta(2^{-m} n^{-1})$. Consequently, the formula for c_n in the proof of Corollary 4.8 gives $c_n = \Theta(2^{-\binom{n}{2}} n^{-1})$.

5. Strategies

This final section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Namely, for a suitable constant $c_n > 0$, we show that Alice can secure at least $c_n w(G)$ in the graph sharing game played on any weighted connected graph G with an odd number of vertices and with no subdivision of K_n. For the entire section, we assume that G is a fixed weighted connected graph with vertex set V. The additional conditions that G has no subdivision of K_n or $|V|$ is odd will be explicitly stated wherever they are required.

We call a set $S \subset V$ *sparse* if the distance in G between any two vertices in S is at least 3. Equivalently, S is sparse if the closed neighborhoods of the vertices in S are pairwise disjoint. We call G *sparsely weighted* if the set of vertices of G with positive weight is sparse.

First, we prove that Alice has a strategy to gather at least $c_n w(G)$ if G is a sparsely weighted graph with an odd number of vertices and with no subdivision of K_n, for a suitable constant $c_n > 0$. This strategy can be as well applied when G, instead of being sparsely weighted, contains a sparse set of vertices with substantial weight (at least a constant fraction of $w(G)$). Then, to prove the theorem for any graph G with an odd number of vertices and with no subdivision of K_n, we present complementary strategies of Alice that work when no sparse set of vertices has substantial weight.

5.1. Strategies on sparsely weighted graphs.

The idea behind the proof of Theorem 1.1 for sparsely weighted graphs is to devise a strategy for each of the two cases resulting from Corollary 4.8. The following lemma is the core of the strategy for the case (1).

Lemma 5.1 ([12])**.** *Assume $|V|$ is odd. Consider an intermediate position in the graph sharing game on G at which a set T of vertices has been taken and Alice is to move ($|T|$ is even). Starting from that position, Alice has a strategy to collect vertices of total weight at least $\frac{1}{2} w^\star(G \setminus T)$.*

For the rest of this subsection, we assume that G is sparsely weighted and $|V|$ is odd. The problem with applying Corollary 4.8 and then Lemma 5.1 directly to G is that when Alice is taking vertices from the separating set S in order to reach a position at which the whole S has been taken, Bob can take some valuable vertices from $V \setminus S$. This can be prevented if $S \cap N[v] = \emptyset$ for every

vertex $v \in V \setminus S$ with positive weight. To ensure the latter whenever we are in the case (1) of Corollary 4.8, we are going to contract the closed neighborhood $N[v]$ of every vertex v with positive weight, thus obtaining a 1-shallow minor G^R of G, and apply Corollary 4.8 to G^R instead of G.

Let V^+ denote the set of vertices of G with positive weight. Hence V^+ is sparse. Define

$$V^R = \big\{N[v] \colon v \in V^+\big\} \cup \big\{\{v\} \colon v \in V \setminus N[V^+]\big\}.$$

It follows that V^R is a partition of V into 1-shallow subsets. Define

$$G^R = G/V^R.$$

Thus G^R is a 1-shallow minor of G. It is weighted by the weight function w inherited from G as follows: for $v^R \in V^R$, we have

$$w(v^R) = \begin{cases} w(v) & \text{if } v^R = N[v] \text{ for some } v \in V^+, \\ 0 & \text{if } v^R = \{v\} \text{ for some } v \in V \setminus N[V^+]. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we have $w(G^R) = w(G)$.

Lemma 5.2. *For every set $S^R \subset V^R$ that is connected in G^R, Alice has a strategy in the graph sharing game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least $\frac{1}{2}w^\star(G^R \setminus S^R)$.*

Proof. Let S^R be a connected set of vertices of G^R. Let $S = \bigcup S^R \subset V$. Clearly, S is connected in G and disjoint from $N[V^+ \setminus S]$. Alice starts by taking an arbitrary vertex from S. Whenever Bob takes a vertex from $N(v)$ for some $v \in V^+ \setminus S$, Alice answers by taking v. Otherwise, unless the entire S has been taken, Alice picks a next available vertex from S. Now, consider Alice's first turn before which the entire S has been taken. Let T be the set of vertices taken thus far. Thus $S \subset T$. Since all vertices in $T \setminus S$ with positive weight have been taken by Alice, she has already gathered at least $w(T \setminus S)$. Alice continues the game with her strategy claimed by Lemma 5.1. This way, she is still going to take at least $\frac{1}{2}w^\star(G \setminus T)$. Therefore, her total outcome on G is at least

$$\begin{aligned} w(T \setminus S) + \tfrac{1}{2}w^\star(G \setminus T) &= w(T \setminus S) + \tfrac{1}{2}w(G \setminus T) - \tfrac{1}{2}\max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus T)} w(C) \\ &\geqslant \tfrac{1}{2}w(G \setminus S) - \tfrac{1}{2}\max_{C \in \mathcal{C}(G \setminus S)} w(C) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}w(G^R \setminus S^R) - \tfrac{1}{2}\max_{C^R \in \mathcal{C}(G^R \setminus S^R)} w(C^R) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}w^\star(G^R \setminus S^R). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *For every set $S^R \subset V^R$ such that $G^R\{S^R\}$ is a cycle, Alice has a strategy in the graph sharing game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least $\frac{1}{6}w(S^R)$.*

Proof. Let S^R be a subset of V^R such that $G^R\{S^R\}$ is a cycle. We can assume without loss of generality that S^R consists only of vertices of G^R of the form $N[v]$ with $v \in V^+$. Indeed, all vertices in S^R of the form $\{v\}$ with $v \in V \setminus N[V^+]$ can be removed from S^R without changing the weight of S^R or violating the condition that $G^R\{S^R\}$ is a cycle. Let

$$S = \big\{v \in V^+ \colon N[v] \in S^R\big\}.$$

It follows that

$$S^R = \{N[v]\colon v \in S\}.$$

Let $n = |S| = |S^R|$. If $n \leqslant 6$, then Alice can take the heaviest vertex in S and thus gather at least $\frac{1}{6}w(S^R)$ with her first move. Thus assume $n > 6$.

Enumerate the vertices in S as $v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1}$ in such a way that the vertices $N[v_0], \ldots, N[v_{n-1}]$ occur in this order on the cycle $G^R\{S^R\}$. Let $v_n = v_0$. Since $G^R\{S^R\}$ is a cycle, the neighborhood in G^R of every component of $G^R \setminus S^R$ consists of either a single vertex $N[v_i]$ or two consecutive vertices $N[v_i]$ and $N[v_{i+1}]$. Therefore, the neighborhood in G of every component of $G \setminus N[S]$ is adjacent to either one set $N(v_i)$ or two consecutive sets $N(v_i)$ and $N(v_{i+1})$. For $0 \leqslant i < n$, let A_i denote the union of $N[v_i]$ and all components of $G \setminus N[S]$ adjacent only to $N(v_i)$, and let $A_{i,i+1}$ denote the union of all components of $G \setminus N[S]$ adjacent to both $N(v_i)$ and $N(v_{i+1})$. The sets A_i and $A_{i,i+1}$ together form a partition of V. For $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j < n$, define

$$\begin{aligned} A(i,j) &= \quad A_{i,i+1} \cup A_{i+1} \cup A_{i+1,i+2} \cup \ldots \cup A_{j-1} \cup A_{j-1,j}, \\ A[i,j) &= A_i \cup A_{i,i+1} \cup A_{i+1} \cup A_{i+1,i+2} \cup \ldots \cup A_{j-1} \cup A_{j-1,j}, \\ A[i,j] &= A_i \cup A_{i,i+1} \cup A_{i+1} \cup A_{i+1,i+2} \cup \ldots \cup A_{j-1} \cup A_{j-1,j} \cup A_j. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &= \big\{v_i \in S\colon |A[0,i)| \text{ is even}\big\}, \\ C_1 &= \big\{v_i \in S\colon |A[0,i)| \text{ is odd}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $C_0 \cup C_1 = S$. Choose $C = C_0$ or $C = C_1$ so that $w(C) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}w(S)$. It follows from the above definitions that

$$\text{if } v_i, v_j \in C, \text{ then } |A[i,j)| \text{ is even, for } 0 \leqslant i < j < n. \tag{5.1}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \big\{v_i \in S\colon |A_i| \text{ is even}\big\}, \\ S_1 &= \big\{v_i \in S\colon |A_i| \text{ is odd}\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Thus $S_0 \cup S_1 = S$. We prove the following two claims:

(1) Alice has a strategy to secure at least $w(S_0 \cap C)$.
(2) Alice has a strategy to secure at least $\frac{1}{2}w(S_1 \cap C)$.

This suffices for the conclusion of the lemma: if $w(S_0 \cap C) \geqslant \frac{1}{3}w(C)$, then Alice can choose a strategy claimed by (1), while if $w(S_1 \cap C) \geqslant \frac{2}{3}w(C)$, then she can choose a strategy claimed by (2).

First, we present a strategy for Alice claimed by (1). She starts by taking v_0. Then, she sticks to the following two rules at each her turn:

- Always take a vertex from S if any is available.
- Never take a vertex from $N(v_i)$ for a non-taken $v_i \in S$ unless forced to.

The first rule ensures that the vertices taken from S always form an interval in the cyclic order on S. Suppose that at some point of the game, Alice is forced to take a vertex from $N(v_i)$ for some non-taken vertex $v_i \in S_0 \cap C$. It follows that the set of non-taken vertices is of the form $A[\ell, r]$ for some ℓ and r with $1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant r < n$ and $v_\ell, v_r \in S_0 \cap C$. Since $v_\ell, v_r \in C$, it follows from (5.1) that $|A[\ell, r)|$ is even. Since $v_r \in S_0$, it follows from (5.2) that $|A_r|$ is even. Hence

$|A[\ell, r]|$ is even. On the other hand, since G has an odd number of vertices and Alice is to move, the number of non-taken vertices, which is $|A[\ell, r]|$, is odd. This contradiction shows that Alice is never forced to take a vertex from $N(v_i)$ for any non-taken $v_i \in S_0 \cap C$, and thus Bob never gets the opportunity to take a vertex from $S_0 \cap C$. Therefore, Alice gathers the whole $S_0 \cap C$.

For Alice's strategy claimed by (2), fix an index $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} w\big(\{v_0, \dots, v_j\} \cap S_1 \cap C\big) &\geqslant \tfrac{1}{2} w(S_1 \cap C), \\ w\big(\{v_j, \dots, v_{n-1}\} \cap S_1 \cap C\big) &\geqslant \tfrac{1}{2} w(S_1 \cap C). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Alice starts by taking v_j. Then, at each her turn, she obeys the same two rules as before. Again, by the first rule, the vertices taken from S form an interval in the cyclic order on S. If Alice is never forced to take a vertex from $N(v_i)$ for any non-taken vertex $v_i \in S_1 \cap C$, then Bob never gets the opportunity to take a vertex from $S_1 \cap C$, so Alice takes the whole $S_1 \cap C$. Otherwise, consider the first position in the game at which Alice is forced to take a vertex from $N(v_i)$ for some non-taken vertex $v_i \in S_1 \cap C$. This is Alice's first turn after which Bob has the opportunity to take a vertex from $S_1 \cap C$. Suppose that v_0 and v_{n-1} have not been taken yet. Let ℓ and r be such that $0 \leqslant \ell < r < n$ and $v_{\ell+1}, \dots, v_{r-1}$ are the vertices taken from S. Thus $v_\ell, v_r \in S_1 \cap C$, and the set of all taken vertices is equal to $A(\ell, r)$. Since $v_\ell, v_r \in C$, it follows from (5.1) that $|A[\ell, r)|$ is even. Since $v_\ell \in S_1$, it follows from (5.2) that $|A_\ell|$ is odd. Hence $|A(\ell, r)|$ is odd. On the other hand, since $A(\ell, r)$ is the set of taken vertices and Alice is to move, $|A(\ell, r)|$ is even. This contradiction shows that at least one of v_1 and v_n have been already taken and thus all $v_0, \dots, v_j$ or all $v_j, \dots, v_{n-1}$ have been taken. Since all vertices from $S_1 \cap C$ taken thus far have been taken by Alice, it follows from (5.3) that she has gathered at least $\frac{1}{2} w(S_1 \cap C)$. □

Corollary 5.4. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is $c_n \in (0, 1]$ such that if G is a sparsely weighted graph with an odd number of vertices and with no subdivision of K_n, then Alice has a strategy in the graph sharing game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least $c_n w(G)$.*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. By Theorem 2.2, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that if G contains no subdivision of K_n, then G^R contains no subdivision of K_N. By Corollary 4.8, there is $c'_N \in (0, 1]$ such that if G^R contains no subdivision of K_N, then at least one of the following holds:

(1) There is a connected set $S^R \subset V^R$ such that
$$w^\star(G^R \setminus S^R) \geqslant c'_N w(G^R).$$
(2) There is a set $S^R \subset V^R$ such that $G^R\{S^R\}$ is a cycle and
$$w(S^R) \geqslant c'_N w(G^R).$$

If (1) holds, then, by Lemma 5.2, Alice has a strategy in the game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least
$$\tfrac{1}{2} w^\star(G^R \setminus S^R) \geqslant \tfrac{1}{2} c'_N w(G^R).$$
If (2) holds, then, by Lemma 5.3, Alice has a strategy in the game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least
$$\tfrac{1}{6} w(S^R) \geqslant \tfrac{1}{6} c'_N w(G^R).$$



FIGURE 5. A legal ordering $\sigma = (u_1, \ldots, u_9)$ of $V \setminus I$

Therefore, the conclusion of the corollary holds with $c_n = \frac{1}{6}c'_N$. □

5.2. **Greedy strategies.** A set $I \subset V$ is *independent* if no two vertices in I are adjacent. We assume in this subsection that $|V| \geqslant 2$, so I is never the whole V. The strategy claimed by Corollary 5.4 is enough for the proof of Theorem 1.1 provided that G contains a sparse set of vertices whose weight is a substantial fraction of $w(G)$. Using Theorem 2.1 iteratively, we can always find an independent set of weight linear in $w(G)$ in a graph G with no subdivision of K_n, but such a heavy sparse set may not exist. For instance, a star with weights uniformly distributed on the leaves has no subdivision of K_3 and no heavy sparse set. However, this case can be easily dealt with by a greedy strategy—to always take a leaf with maximum weight. We are going to present a family of greedy strategies and prove that they can deal with all cases of a graph G to which Corollary 5.4 cannot be applied. These strategies are parametrized by an independent set I (supposed to carry a lot of weight) and a linear ordering σ of $V \setminus I$, and work basically as follows: take vertices from I greedily or, when no vertex in I is available, take the vertices from $V \setminus I$ in the order σ.

Recall that if π is a linear ordering of a set X and $x \in X$, then we define

$$\pi^-(x) = \big\{y \in X \colon y <_\pi x\big\}.$$

Fix an independent set $I \subset V$. A linear ordering σ of $V \setminus I$ is *legal* if the following holds for every vertex $v \in V \setminus I$ except the first one in the order σ:

$$v \in N(\sigma^-(v)) \cup N\big(N(\sigma^-(v)) \cap I\big).$$

For every legal linear ordering σ of $V \setminus I$ and every $v \in V \setminus I$, define

$$B_\sigma(v) = \big(N(v) \cap I\big) \setminus \big(N(\sigma^-(v)) \cap I\big).$$

See Figure 5. For fixed σ, the non-empty sets $B_\sigma(v)$ partition the whole I. For every legal linear ordering σ of $V \setminus I$ and every $v \in V \setminus I$, if $B_\sigma(v) \neq \emptyset$, then choose a vertex $u_\sigma(v)$ in $B_\sigma(v)$ with maximum weight. If there are several vertices in $B_\sigma(v)$ with maximum weight, then the choice of $u_\sigma(v)$ should be made according to some criterion common for all σ, so that for any two legal linear orderings σ and σ' of $V \setminus I$, if $B_\sigma(v) \supset B_{\sigma'}(v) \neq \emptyset$ and $u_\sigma(v) \neq u_{\sigma'}(v)$, then $u_\sigma(v) \notin B_{\sigma'}(v)$. For fixed σ, the vertices $u_\sigma(v)$ are distinct. Define

$$U_\sigma = \big\{u_\sigma(v) \colon v \in V \setminus I \text{ and } B_\sigma(v) \neq \emptyset\big\}.$$

Note that $U_\sigma \subset I$.

Lemma 5.5. *For every independent set $I \subset V$ and every legal linear ordering σ of $V \setminus I$, Alice has a strategy in the graph sharing game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least $\frac{1}{2}w(I \setminus U_\sigma)$.*

Proof. Let σ be a legal linear ordering of $V \setminus I$. We can assume without loss of generality that all vertices in $V \setminus I$ have zero weight. The strategy of Alice goes as follows. Start by taking from $V \setminus I$ the first vertex in the order σ. In every subsequent move, if a vertex in I is available, then take one with maximum weight. Otherwise, take from $V \setminus I$ the first non-taken vertex in the order σ. Such a vertex is always available, as σ is legal.

It suffices to show that Bob's final outcome is at most Alice's outcome plus $w(U_\sigma)$. To this end, for every vertex $u \in I$ collected by Bob, we bound $w(u)$ from above by $w(v)$ or $w(u_\sigma(v))$, where v is the vertex taken by Alice in her directly preceding move. Consider the position in the game just before Alice takes v. If $v \in I$, then both u and v are available at this position and thus $w(u) \leqslant w(v)$. Otherwise, Alice's move taking v makes u available, and hence $u \in B_\sigma(v)$, which implies $w(u) \leqslant w(u_\sigma(v))$. □

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.**

Lemma 5.6. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there is $c_n \in (0,1]$ such that if G contains no subdivision of K_n, then at least one of the following conditions holds:*

1. *There is a sparse set $S \subset V$ such that $w(S) \geqslant c_n w(G)$.*
2. *There are an independent set $I \subset V$ and a legal linear ordering σ of $V \setminus I$ such that $w(I \setminus U_\sigma) \geqslant c_n w(G)$.*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Let $p_n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a constant claimed by Theorem 2.4. We show that it is enough to set

$$c_n = \frac{1}{(p_n^2 + 4p_n + 5)(p_n^2 + 4p_n + 3)}. \tag{5.4}$$

Let G be a weighted connected graph with vertex set V and with no subdivision of K_n. By Theorem 2.4, G is p_n-arrangeable. Therefore, in view of Observation 2.3, there is a linear ordering π of V with the following properties:

$$|N_\pi^-(v)| \leqslant p_n + 1 \qquad \text{for } v \in V, \tag{5.5}$$

$$|N_\pi^-(N[v]) \cap \pi^-(v)| \leqslant p_n^2 + 4p_n + 2 \quad \text{for } v \in V. \tag{5.6}$$

By (5.6), we can color V greedily according to the ordering π so as to distinguish any two vertices u and v such that $u \in N_\pi^-(N[v]) \cap \pi^-(v)$, and we use at most $p_n^2 + 4p_n + 3$ colors to this end. Let I be a set of vertices with the same color which maximizes $w(I)$. It follows that I is independent and the following holds:

$$\text{if } |N(v) \cap I| \geqslant 2, \text{ then } N(v) \cap I \subset \pi^+(v), \text{ for } v \in V, \tag{5.7}$$

$$w(I) \geqslant \frac{w(G)}{p_n^2 + 4p_n + 3}. \tag{5.8}$$

Let σ be a legal linear ordering of $V \setminus I$ minimizing $w(U_\sigma)$. If

$$w(I \setminus U_\sigma) \geqslant (p_n^2 + 4p_n + 3) c_n w(I),$$

then, by (5.8), we have

$$w(I \setminus U_\sigma) \geqslant c_n w(G),$$

so (2) holds for I and σ. Thus assume

$$w(I \setminus U_\sigma) < (p_n^2 + 4p_n + 3) c_n w(I). \tag{5.9}$$

Define

$$V^\star = \big\{v \in V \setminus I \colon |N(v) \cap I| \geqslant 2\big\},$$
$$V^\star_\sigma = \big\{v \in V \setminus I \colon |N(v) \cap U_\sigma| \geqslant 2\big\} \subset V^\star.$$

By (5.7), we have $N(v) \cap I \subset \pi^+(v)$ for every $v \in V^\star$. This and (5.5) yield

$$|N(u) \cap V^\star| \leqslant p_n + 1 \quad \text{for } u \in I. \tag{5.10}$$

Let $v \in V^\star_\sigma$. Let q^v_σ be the first vertex in the order σ such that $N(v) \cap B_\sigma(q^v_\sigma) \neq \emptyset$. By the definition of $V^\star_\sigma$, we have $|N(v) \cap U_\sigma| \geqslant 2$, so q^v_σ exists and $q^v_\sigma <_\sigma v$. Let σ^v be the linear ordering of $V(G) \setminus I$ obtained from σ by moving v to the first position after q^v_σ. It is clear that σ^v is legal. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\sigma^v}(x) &= B_\sigma(x) && \text{for } x \in \sigma^-(q^v_\sigma) \cup \{q^v_\sigma\}, \\ B_{\sigma^v}(x) &= B_\sigma(x) \setminus B_{\sigma^v}(v) && \text{for } x \in \sigma^+(q^v_\sigma) \setminus \{v\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Define

$$Y^v_\sigma = U_\sigma \setminus U_{\sigma^v}, \qquad Z^v_\sigma = U_{\sigma^v} \setminus U_\sigma.$$

Since σ has been chosen so as to minimize $w(U_\sigma)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(U_{\sigma^v} \setminus U_\sigma) - w(U_\sigma \setminus U_{\sigma^v}) &= w(U_{\sigma^v}) - w(U_\sigma) \geqslant 0, \\ w(Y^v_\sigma) = w(U_\sigma \setminus U_{\sigma^v}) &\leqslant w(U_{\sigma^v} \setminus U_\sigma) = w(Z^v_\sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

The definition of σ^v yields $N(v) \cap B_{\sigma^v}(x) = \emptyset$ for $x \notin \{q^v_\sigma, v\}$. Therefore,

$$N(v) \cap (U_\sigma \setminus Y^v_\sigma) \subset N(v) \cap U_{\sigma^v} \subset \{u_{\sigma^v}(q^v_\sigma), u_{\sigma^v}(v)\}, \tag{5.13}$$

Now, let $u \in Z^v_\sigma = U_{\sigma^v} \setminus U_\sigma$. By (5.11), one of the following holds:

- $u = u_{\sigma^v}(v) \in N(v) \cap I$; hence $v \in N(u) \cap V^\star$.
- $u = u_{\sigma^v}(x) \in N(x) \cap I$ for some $x \in V \setminus I$ such that $u_\sigma(x) \in B_{\sigma^v}(v) \subset N(v) \cap I$; moreover, since $u_\sigma(x)$ and $u_{\sigma^v}(x)$ are two distinct vertices in $N(x) \cap I$, we have $x \in V^\star$; hence $x \in N(u) \cap V^\star$ and $v \in N(u_\sigma(x)) \cap V^\star$.

Therefore,

$$\{v \in V^\star_\sigma \colon u \in Z^v_\sigma\} \subset (N(u) \cap V^\star) \cup \bigcup_{x \in N(u) \cap V^\star} (N(u_\sigma(x)) \cap V^\star),$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\{v \in V^\star_\sigma \colon u \in Z^v_\sigma\}| &\leqslant |N(u) \cap V^\star| + \sum_{x \in N(u) \cap V^\star} |N(u_\sigma(x)) \cap V^\star| \\ &\leqslant (p_n + 1)(p_n + 2) && \text{by (5.10).} \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V^\star_\sigma} w(Y^v_\sigma) &\leqslant \sum_{v \in V^\star_\sigma} w(Z^v_\sigma) && \text{by (5.12)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in I \setminus U_\sigma} |\{v \in V^\star_\sigma \colon u \in Z^v_\sigma\}| \cdot w(u) \\ &\leqslant (p_n + 1)(p_n + 2) w(I \setminus U_\sigma) && \text{by (5.14)} \\ &< (p_n^2 + 3p_n + 2)(p_n^2 + 4p_n + 3) c_n w(I) && \text{by (5.9).} \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Define

$$U^\star_\sigma = U_\sigma \setminus \bigcup_{v \in V^\star_\sigma} Y^v_\sigma.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w(U^\star_\sigma) &\geqslant w(U_\sigma) - \sum_{v\in V^\star_\sigma} w(Y^v_\sigma) \\ &> \big(1-(p_n^2+3p_n+3)(p_n^2+4p_n+3)c_n\big)w(I) && \text{by (5.9) and (5.15)} \\ &= (p_n+2)(p_n^2+4p_n+3)c_n w(I) && \text{by (5.4)} \\ &\geqslant (p_n+2)c_n w(G) && \text{by (5.8).} \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Fix a vertex $v \in U^\star_\sigma$. If a vertex $u \in U^\star_\sigma$ is at distance 2 from v in G, then u and v share a neighbor $x_u \in V \setminus I$. Since $|N(x)\cap I| \geqslant 2$, we have $x \in N(v)\cap V^\star$. By (5.13), we have $N(x) \cap U^\star_\sigma = \{u, v\}$. Therefore, by (5.10), v is at distance 2 from at most $p_n + 1$ other vertices in $U^\star_\sigma$. It follows that the vertices in $U^\star_\sigma$ can be colored (greedily) with at most $p_n + 2$ colors so that no two of them at distance 2 in G receive the same color. Let C be a color class with maximum weight. It follows that C is sparse in G and, by (5.16),

$$w(C) \geqslant \frac{w(U^\star_\sigma)}{p_n+2} > c_n w(G).$$

This shows that (1) holds for C. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Let $c'_n \in (0, 1]$ be a constant claimed by Lemma 5.6 and $c''_n \in (0, 1]$ be a constant claimed by Corollary 5.4. We show that it is enough to set

$$c_n = c'_n \cdot \min\{c''_n, \tfrac{1}{2}\}.$$

Let G be a weighted connected graph with an odd number of vertices and with no subdivision of K_n. By Lemma 5.6, at least one of the following holds:

(1) There is a sparse set $S \subset V(G)$ such that $w(S) \geqslant c'_n w(G)$.
(2) There are an independent set $I \subset V(G)$ and a legal linear ordering σ of $V(G) \setminus I$ such that $w(I \setminus U_\sigma) \geqslant c'_n w(G)$.

Suppose that (1) holds. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by resetting the weights of all vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ to zero. Hence

$$w(G') = w_G(S) \geqslant c'_n w(G).$$

By Corollary 5.4, Alice has a strategy in the game on G' to collect vertices of total weight at least $c'_n w(G') \geqslant c'_n c''_n w(G) \geqslant c_n w(G)$. The same strategy gives Alice at least $c_n w(G)$ in the game on G.

If (2) holds, then, by Lemma 5.5, Alice has a strategy in the game on G to collect vertices of total weight at least $\frac{1}{2}w(I \setminus U_\sigma) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}c'_n w(G) \geqslant c_n w(G)$. □

References

[1] Béla Bollobás and Andrew Thomason. Proof of a conjecture of Mader, Erdős and Hajnal on topological complete subgraphs. *Europ. J. Combin.*, 19(8):883–887, 1998.

[2] Guantao Chen and Richard H. Schelp. Graphs with linearly bounded Ramsey numbers. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 57(1):138–149, 1993.

[3] Josef Cibulka, Jan Kynčl, Viola Mészáros, Rudolf Stolař, and Pavel Valtr. Solution to Peter Winkler's pizza problem. In Gyula O.H. Katona, Alexander Schrijver, and Tamás Szőnyi, editors, *Fete of Combinatorics and Computer Science*, volume 20 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 69–93. Springer, Berlin, 2010.

[4] Josef Cibulka, Jan Kynčl, Viola Mészáros, Rudolf Stolař, and Pavel Valtr. Graph sharing games: complexity and connectivity. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 494:49–62, 2013.

[5] Zdeněk Dvořák. On forbidden subdivision characterizations of graph classes. *Europ. J. Combin.*, 29(5):1321–1332, 2008.
[6] Adam Gągol. Parity and minors in graph sharing games. Master's thesis, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, 2011. `http://tcs.uj.edu.pl/docs.php?id=38`.
[7] Heinz A. Jung. Zusammenzüge und Unterteilungen von Graphen. *Math. Nachr.*, 35(5–6):241–267, 1967.
[8] Kolja Knauer, Piotr Micek, and Torsten Ueckerdt. How to eat $\frac{4}{9}$ of a pizza. *Discrete Math.*, 311(16):1635–1645, 2011.
[9] János Komlós and Endre Szemerédi. Topological cliques in graphs II. *Combin. Prob. Comput.*, 5(1):79–90, 1996.
[10] Wolfgang Mader. Homomorphieeigenschaften und mittlere Kantendichte von Graphen. *Math. Ann.*, 174(4):265–268, 1967.
[11] Piotr Micek and Bartosz Walczak. A graph-grabbing game. *Combin. Prob. Comput.*, 20(4):623–629, 2011.
[12] Piotr Micek and Bartosz Walczak. Parity in graph sharing games. *Discrete Math.*, 312(10):1788–1795, 2012.
[13] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Linear time low tree-width partitions and algorithmic consequences. In Jon M. Kleinberg, editor, *38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2006)*, pages 391–400. ACM, New York, 2006.
[14] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. Fraternal augmentations, arrangeability and linear Ramsey numbers. *European J. Combin.*, 30(7):1696–1703, 2009.
[15] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona de Mendez. *Sparsity*, volume 28 of *Algorithms Combin.* Springer, Berlin, 2012.
[16] Vojtěch Rödl and Robin Thomas. Arrangeability and clique subdivisions. In Ronald L. Graham and Jaroslav Nešetřil, editors, *The Mathematics of Paul Erdős II*, volume 14 of *Algorithms Combin.*, pages 236–239. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
[17] Deborah E. Seacrest and Tyler Seacrest. Grabbing the gold. *Discrete Math.*, 312(10):1804–1806, 2012.
[18] Bartosz Walczak. *Graph sharing games: strategies and algorithms*. PhD thesis, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, 2012. `http://tcs.uj.edu.pl/docs.php?id=32`.

(Adam Gągol, Piotr Micek) Theoretical Computer Science Department, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: `gagol@tcs.uj.edu.pl, micek@tcs.uj.edu.pl`

(Bartosz Walczak) Theoretical Computer Science Department, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland; School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA
E-mail address: `walczak@tcs.uj.edu.pl`